

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were presented for examination. By the aforementioned Office Action, Claims 1-9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 11-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Furthermore, Claim 8 was also objected due to a formality error. The drawings were objected to as the references in figures 1 and 2 were labeled with letters that were not mentioned in the specification.

By this Amendment, Claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled, Claims 6, 10 and 13 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-7, 10-15 pending. New drawings for pages 1/4 and 2/4 are submitted. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the Office Action is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth below.

1. Drawings

The drawings were objected to because the references were labeled with the letters from figures 1 and 2 that were not mentioned in the specification. Accordingly, figures 1 and 2 have been amended, according to the suggestion of the Examiner, such that each of the letter references is now replaced with a whole word which can easily identify the particular parts in the structure of the system.

2. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

2.1 Rejection of Claims 1-5

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Misner (US Patent No. 6,570,668 B1).

Claim 1 relates to a method that enables a computer to select a set of printer driver settings for an application from stored sets of printer driver settings.

Each set has a respective label illustrating its general aspect. The method includes selecting a first label from a list of respective labels, searching the stored sets of printer driver settings for the set which label conforms to the first label, and defining the conforming set of printer driver settings as the current printer driver settings for the application.

Misner discloses a method for altering a current printer driver (or a printer driver setting) of an application. When the application sends a print request, a corresponding printer driver is called. The printer driver accesses a database file whose name is defined in the printer driver operating instructions. The printer driver searches the database file to determine whether the name of the application is listed under any headings in the file. If the name of the application is included in the database file, the settings of the printer driver is modified based on which heading(s) the name of the application comes under.

Accordingly, Misner does not disclose different sets of printer driver settings that can be selected for the application. The printer driver of the application only reads from the database file what modifications, if any, are to be made to the current printer driver setting based on the content of the database file. In addition, Misner does not disclose a label which illustrates a general aspect of the printer driver setting.

In the Office Action, it seems the Examiner is of the opinion that the label referred to in Claim 1 corresponds to the name of the database file of Misner, and that each application in Misner is associated with a different printer driver, and hence, a different database file. The Applicant submits that the database file (and also the printer driver) of Misner does not correspond to only one application, but several applications (see col.2 lines 38 to 42 and the example of a database file "s5100p.ini" at col.3 which both show that the database file is not specific to one application). Therefore, the selection of one application does not inherently select the name of a database file, contrary to the Examiner's opinion in the Office Action. Accordingly, the label referred to in Claim 1 is different from the name of the database file of Misner.

From the above, it can be seen that the application disclosed in Misner does not have stored set of printer driver settings to select from, and does not have a respective label illustrating the general aspects of each of the printer driver setting. As a result, Misner would not disclose or anticipate the selection of a first label from a list of respective labels, and searching the stored sets of printer driver settings for one set whose respective label conforms to the first label as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, the subject matters of Claim 1, and Claims 2-5 dependent thereof, are novel over Misner.

2.2 Rejection of Claims 6-9, 15

Claims 6-9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for being anticipated by Gase et al. (US Patent No. 5,580,177).

The amended Claim 6 relates to a network including a host computer with a public memory unit for storing sets of public printer driver settings and a client computer connected to the host computer. When an application in the client computer requests to print, the client computer retrieves an appropriate set of public printer driver settings from the public memory unit of the host computer. The client computer has a client memory unit for storing sets of private printer settings. Each set of the public and private printer settings is attached with a respective label that indicates its general aspect.

Gase discloses a network which includes client processors, a file server and printers. Each of the client processors has a memory unit for storing a printer driver procedure for interfacing with a printer via the file server. The file server has a memory which stores the most updated printer driver procedures of the printers. When one of the client processors sends a printer request to print from one of the printers, the file server replaces the printer driver procedure of the client processor with the most updated version if the printer driver procedure of the client processor is not the most updated version.

The Applicant submits that the printer driver procedure of Gase refers to a set of protocols that enables the client processor to "talk" to the printer (see

abstract and col. 3 lines 18 to 24 of Gase). Accordingly, the printer driver procedure of Gase is not identical to the printer driver setting recited in Claim 6.

Furthermore, the Applicant notes that the label "driver A" or "driver B" shown in Fig.1 of Gase does not illustrate its respective printer driver procedure, and hence, is not indicative of any general aspects of said respective printer driver procedure (assuming that the printer driver procedure is identical to the printer driver settings for comparison purposes only) as recited in Claim 6.

Accordingly, the subject matters of Claim 6, and Claims 7, 10-15 dependent thereof, are novel over Gase.


3. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow the pending Claims 1-7, 10-15, and to issue a Notice of Allowance for the present application.

Date: July 15 , 2004

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,



Wendell J. Jones
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 45,961
Tel. No.: (650) 857-7453